



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of

PLANNING BOARD

CARLISLE EDUCATION CENTER

872 WESTFORD ST. P.O. Box 827

Phone: 369-9702

Fax: 369-4521

MINUTES MEETING OF APRIL 25, 1994

Vice Chair Duscha convened the meeting at 8:08. Members present were newly elected John La Liberte, Chaput, Colman, Evans, and Yanofsky. The board voted new officers for the period which will end with Town Elections next spring. Yanofsky nominated and Chaput seconded the nomination of Colman for chair; Colman nominated and Evans seconded the nomination of Yanofsky for treasurer; Colman nominated and Duscha seconded the nomination of Evans for vice chair; and Evans nominated and Colman seconded the nomination of Chaput for clerk. All nominations were voted unanimously. The board will assign committee and board liaisons at the next meeting when it is expected new member Tara Hengeveld will be present.

The minutes of 3/23/94 were approved as drafted with Duscha, Yanofsky, Chaput and Colman voting in favor and Evans and La Liberte abstaining.

The minutes of the meeting of 3/28/94 were approved as amended with Evans, Yanofsky, Duscha, and Chaput voting in favor and Colman and La Liberte abstaining.

The minutes of the public hearing of 3/28/94 were approved as drafted with Evans, Yanofsky, Duscha and Chaput in favor and Colman and La Liberte abstaining.

The minutes of 4/11/94 were approved as amended with Yanofsky, Chaput and Colman in favor, and Duscha, La Liberte, and Evans abstaining.

The Planner Assistant reported that, with the approval of Treasurer Colman, she had reviewed the department budget at Fincom's request. Fincom wished to have an updated prediction of the over run; she calculated the board will need an additional \$1200 (over the 2/15 prediction) by the end of the fiscal year. Colman reviewed her report before she submitted it to Cohen; it will be included in next meeting's packet.

Senior Residential Open Space Community Bylaw and Conservation Clusters Bylaw amendments Present for this discussion was former member Ernstoff. The board discussed the few changes which the Planner Assistant had prepared as a result of board decisions at the meeting of April 11 and as a result of her consultation with town counsel. For SROSC, they included the insertion of a limitation of the special permit to Residence District B, the change of the age limitation from one based on ownership to one based on residency, the requirement that if the Town does not own the open space a permanent restriction must be in place, and the requirement for the submission of an open space maintenance agreement. For conservation clusters, the changes were the same open space restriction requirement as in SROSC, and a slightly different renumbering scheme. These

changes would need to be moved as amendments to the bylaw articles as published in the warrant.

The board discussed the draft SROSC presentation submitted by Chaput and the handout submitted by Bayne. The presentation focused on the evolution of the bylaw from master plan work, and the most important features of the bylaw. Chaput would also describe the features of the sketch plans, which would be on transparency. Chaput had spoken with Moderator Simonds, who had suggested a process for the board to follow in moving the articles and the amendments. The handout included a letter to the voters explaining the reasons for the changes, the process for Town Meeting, a sketch comparing a standard subdivision and a SROSC, and the text of both bylaws with the amendments to the warrant highlighted. Bayne was asked to make 250 copies of the handout.

Evans reported his research on the issue of development costs. In a survey of three local realtors, he had determined that a market value of \$210,000-225,000 is likely, and that unimproved land costs are likely to be \$90,000-100,000 per unit. These costs argue for the density factor of 1.5 as the minimum feasible density. Yanofsky questioned how to explain the density factor. Ernstoff suggested that it must be addressed, and that the explanation should state that for reasons of providing senior housing and preserving open space, we want SROSC to happen; without a certain density, the bylaw will not be feasible for developers to use. On a motion by Chaput seconded by Evans, the board voted 5 to 1 to support the SROSC bylaw (article 22) as amended by the handout. Duscha explained that her negative vote meant that although she is satisfied with the intent of the bylaw as embodied in the purpose section, she is not satisfied with some details of the implementation. On a motion by Duscha, seconded by Yanofsky, the board voted unanimously to support the conservation cluster amendment (article 31) as amended in the handout.

Interim Master Plan Report Board members noted their satisfaction with Yanofsky's work. She asked if, in light of the fact the board had not yet had time to review the results of the Community Day questionnaire as compiled by Duscha and interpreted by Duscha and Yanofsky, and in light of the fact the board had not had time to review their memo regarding Master Plan directions for the coming year, the board really wanted to hand out the interim report at Town Meeting. Colman felt that the board had committed to doing so, and that this report does not have the immutability of the final Master Plan. Duscha felt that although there is a great deal of work to be done, and there are issues so far unresolved, nevertheless, the report demonstrates our extensive effort to be inclusive, and is therefore worth circulating. The board agreed to amend the draft by removing the goals from the text and using them as an addendum, along with the boards and committees mailing list. Yanofsky volunteered to get 250 copies made for circulation at Town Meeting.

Town Hall Choices Jay Luby was present for the discussion. Board members discussed whether they should take a position at Town Meeting, given they had, as recently as the last meeting, felt they hadn't enough information. The board also discussed what the position would be should they take one. Chaput distributed a decision matrix she'd created to help herself. Her conclusion was that, unless one's overriding interest is the acquisition of the Malcolm land, the best choice for a town hall is to build a new one on the Conant land. The distance of the Congregational church from town center, its existence in a

residential neighborhood, and its age all contributed to her negative conclusion regarding that proposal. She, like Yanofsky, felt the two issues of acquiring a new town hall and acquiring the Malcolm land should be separated. Evans moved the board take a position, lest it appear to the town the board is disinterested in town planning issues. Yanofsky seconded the motion, and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion. Evans moved and Duscha seconded that the board support article 2, which instructs the Selectmen to move forward on the Congregational church proposal. Yanofsky asked why the latest proposal stipulates as much money being offered by the town as the original proposal although we would receive fewer acres under the new version. Ernstoff commented the deal is different now, but not necessarily worse. Colman pointed out the major deciding factor is the value each person places on the acquisition of the Malcolm land. Yanofsky suggested there may be another way to protect the Malcolm land, whether it be rezoning, purchase, or conservation restrictions. Ernstoff predicted that if the town were asked to buy Malcolm, Town Meeting would decide it could not afford it. Several members felt the deal is too much of a compromise in every aspect. Luby addressed the board, stating he feels the deal is a win-win situation. Although the Congregational church had been asked before to sell the Malcolm land, it had never before been willing. He also stated that the recreation commission had voted to support the proposal because, among other reasons, it felt the church's offer to locate soccer and baseball fields on the church parcel is a good compromise. In addition, through church resources, the renovation of the church into town offices and the field construction could be done at cost. He also pointed out the advantages of dealing with a known entity, the existing church, rather than trying to define the costs of a new building, especially if on the ledgy Conant land. The memorandum of agreement with the church also stipulates the limitation of the use of the building lot at Malcolm to a specific area, which might allow either a cluster or a senior residential open space community, were that article to pass. Luby was asked if the Malcolm land is in 61-A protection; he stated it is. The board noted that means the town will have the right of first refusal later if the church proposes to sell it.

The board voted against the motion to support article 2; Chaput, Yanofsky, Evans and La Liberte voted no; Duscha and Colman voted yes. Chaput moved, and Evans seconded, that the board support article 3, which instructs the Selectmen to investigate further the building of a new town hall on St. Irene's property or on the town owned Conant land. The board voted unanimously to support this article.

Regarding Town Meeting, the board agreed Yanofsky would present the board's position on the Kulmala land (no on giving it to Audubon), Evans would present the road acceptance positions (yes on Cranberry Hill Lane, no on Hartwell Road), and Colman would present the board's position on the town hall articles.

Colman will review the Penhune common driveway application for the 5/9 public hearing. Board members expressed their regret that Ernstoff had decided not to run in the April election, and had retired from the board. They thanked him for his skillful leadership, and for his hard work on the town hall project and the SROSC bylaw. The hope was expressed that he might find time to serve again someday.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30.

Sandy Bayne, P.A.